

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were examined by the Office, and in the Office Action of July 5, 2007, claims 1-2 and 4-16 are rejected, and claim 3 is objected to. With this response no claims are amended, added or cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Rejections Under § 102

In section 3, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 11-12 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Koponen et al. (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2002/0085511). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Koponen, because Koponen fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Koponen at least fails to disclose or suggest that in case of a failure of a requested connection an indication of a cause of the failure is received from the mobile communication network and forwarded to the terminal equipment, as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is directed to data exchange between terminal equipment and a mobile communication network via a mobile terminal, and specifically recites receiving from the terminal equipment a request to establish a connection to the mobile communication network for exchanging data. Therefore, claim 1 recites a method related to establishing a connection for exchanging data.

Applicant acknowledges that Koponen discusses in paragraph [0044] that if the network rejects the registration, a “reject” message is transmitted from the network to the sender of the authentication message to indicate to the wireless communication device does not accept the registration, and a reason for the rejection is included in the “reject” message. However, this section of Koponen, i.e. paragraphs [0041]-[0045] relates to the registration process of registering the mobile station (20) into the network using the registration information of the PDA device (10). In contrast, claim 1 recites establishing a connection for exchanging data. Registration of a device with a network is not the equivalent of establishing a connection with that network for exchanging data. Instead, Koponen discusses establishing a data call connection in paragraphs [0049]-[0055]. See e.g. Koponen paragraph [0049] (on the basis of the registration information the mobile station can in a connection established later forward to the PDA device information, such as data, received from the network). The PDA device sets up a data call

connection from the mobile terminal to a number from which information content is desired. See Koponen paragraph [0054]. The data call is set up by a call\_setup message, and while Koponen does disclose that the call set-up request may be rejected by the network, Koponen fails to disclose or suggest providing an indication of the cause of the rejection. Instead, Koponen only discloses that the mobile station (20) transmits the message received from the network to the PDA device (10) to let the PDA device know whether the call set-up request was accepted or rejected. See Koponen paragraph [0053]. However, no indication of the reason for rejection is provided by the network in the message. In contrast, claim 1 recites that in case a failure occurs concerning the requested connection, i.e. the connection for exchanging data, an indication of a cause of the failure is provided. Therefore, for at least this reason, claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Koponen, because Koponen fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from independent claim 1, and are not disclosed or suggested by Koponen at least in view of their dependencies.

Independent claims 7-8 ,11-12, and 14-15 contain limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, claims 7-8, 11-12 and 14-15 are not disclosed or suggested by Koponen.

Claim 9 depends from independent claim 9, and is not disclosed or suggested by Koponen at least in view of its dependency.

#### Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 4, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 5, 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Koponen. Claims 5, 10 and 16 ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are not disclosed or suggested by Koponen at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 5, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Koponen in view of Chou (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,526). Claims 6 and 13 ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Allowable Subject Matter

In section 6, on page 4 of the Office Action claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant believes that claim 3 is patentable over the cited references due to its dependency from independent claim 1, and therefore does not wish to place claim 3 in independent form..

Conclusion

The rejections of the Office Action having been shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested, and passage to issue of the present application is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7 September 2007

Keith R. Obert

Keith R. Obert  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No. 58,051

KRO/kas  
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676  
Customer No. 004955